

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-10 are pending in the application, with 1, 4, 5, and 6 being the independent claims. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 9, and 10 have been amended. These changes introduce no new matter, and entry is respectfully requested. Support for the amendment can be found in the Specification at paragraphs 0026, 0032, and 0034, among other locations.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claim 1, arguing that U.S. Patent 6,359,882 ("Robles") discloses several of the features of this claim. In particular, the Examiner argues that Robles discloses the replacing of null data packets with data frames in an MPEG stream. The Examiner further argues that U.S. Patent 6,633,564 ("Steer") discloses a system where DOCSIS data is interleaved into an MPEG stream.

Claim 1 has been amended to claim a system in which a media access control device receives a MPEG video data stream, replaces each null data packet with a DOCSIS data frame having a DOCSIS program ID, and produces an interleaved data stream comprising MPEG video data packets and said DOCSIS data frames. Such replacement of a null packet with a DOCSIS data frame having a DOCSIS program ID is

not disclosed or suggested by either Steer or Robles. For at least these reasons, claim 1 is not rendered obvious by any of the cited references, taken alone or in combination.

Claims 2 and 3 depend on claim 1 and therefore include all features of claim 1, including the feature of replacing each null data packet in an MPEG stream with a DOCSIS data frame having a DOCSIS program ID. The Examiner's rejection of claims 2 and 3 is premised on his contention that Robles and Steer render claim 1 obvious. Given that the replacement of a null packet with a DOCSIS data frame having a DOCSIS program ID is not disclosed or suggested by either Steer or Robles, neither claim 2 nor 3 is rendered obvious by the cited references, taken alone or in combination.

The Examiner has rejected claims 4-6, arguing that Robles discloses the replacing of null data packets in an MPEG stream with data frames. Independent claims 4-6 as amended now include the feature of replacing each null data packet with a DOCSIS data frame having a DOCSIS program ID, and producing an interleaved data stream comprising MPEG video data and said DOCSIS data frames. Neither Robles nor any of the other cited references disclose or suggest this feature, as discussed above. For at least this reason, none of claims 4-6 are rendered obvious by any of the cited references, when considered alone or in combination.

The Examiner's rejection of claims 7-10 is premised on his contention that Robles discloses the replacing of null data packets in an MPEG stream with data frames. Claims 7-10 depend on claim 6 and therefore include all features of amended claim 6, including the feature of replacing each null data packet with a DOCSIS data frame having a DOCSIS program ID, and producing an interleaved data stream comprising MPEG video data and said DOCSIS data frames. Neither Robles nor any of the other cited references

discloses this feature, as discussed above. For at least this reason, none of claims 7-10 are rendered obvious by any of the cited references, alone or in combination.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Edward W. Yee
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 47,294

Date: AUG. 4, 2006

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600